



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,243	03/25/2005	Lauri Loven	3501-1096	8635
<small>465</small> YOUNG & THOMPSON 209 Madison Street Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			<small>7590</small> EXAMINER BUCKINGHAM, KELLYE DEE	
			ART UNIT 2165	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/12/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,243

Applicant(s)

LOVEN ET AL.

Examiner

KELLYE BUCKINGHAM

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-17 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/8/08 and 10/27/08
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to applicant's communication filed May 02, 2008 in response to PTO Office Action dated June 23, 2008. The Applicant's remarks and amendments to the claims and/or the specification were considered with the results that follow.
2. Claims 8-17 have been presented for examination in this application. In response to the last Office Action, Claims 8, 10, and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-7 were previously cancelled, claims 16-17 have been added. As a result, claims 8-17 are now pending in this application.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. As required by **M.P.E.P. 609(C)**, the applicant's submissions of the Information Disclosure Statement dated October 27, 2008 is acknowledged by the examiner and the cited references have been considered in the examination of the claims now pending. As required by **M.P.E.P 609 C(2)**, a copy of the PTOL-1449 initialed and dated by the examiner is attached to the instant office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugikawa et al. US Patent 5,949,772 in view of Amano 2002/0120647.

Regarding claim 8, Sugikawa et al. teach a method of processing service requests in an information system including a common access point and at least two service sources offering services, said method comprising:

receiving a service request at said access point (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device), analyzing said service request at said access point in order to identify a predetermined keyword indicating a service source offering the requested service (column 11, lines 31-34, predetermined service data, i.e. interpret data as a keyword), forwarding said service request to a service source identified in said analysis (column 11, lines 41-65, data processing sections, B, C, D, and E), analyzing said service request at said service source in order to identify the requested service, providing said identified service (column 12, lines 8-23, the control unit analyzes the destination device identification data of the received data), storing, in a memory **containing only service requests whose contents are correct** (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services, the spec does not provide definition of the term correct,

there examiner interprets since its in the memory that it's correct), said service request if the service request has led to successful identification of the requested service (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services).

However, he does not teach initiating an error correction process to correct the received service request by utilizing service requests stored in said memory, if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request, as no service source or no service can be identified, and repeating said analyzing at the access point and/or service source for the corrected service request.

Amano disclose initiating an error correction process to correct the received service request by utilizing service requests stored in said memory **containing only service requests whose contents are correct (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services, the spec does not provide definition of the term correct, there examiner interprets since its in the memory that it's correct)**, (paragraph 1—20, predetermine elements from application data that are recognized that they are incorrectly generated based on the stored application data), if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request , as no service source or no service can be identified, and repeating said analyzing at the access point and/or service source for the corrected service request (paragraph 83, if two values don't match, a check is perform and automatic correction is done, unless its disabled then its processed manually).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Regarding claim 9, Sugikawa et al further teaches a method according to claim 8, wherein the correction of a received service request is carried out by comparing the contents of the received service request with the contents of the stored service requests,

selecting the stored service request which, based on the comparison, is closest to the received service request (column 7, lines 40-46, selecting a communication device based on the request submitted), however, he does not substitute at least a part of the contents of the received service request with at least a part of the contents of the selected service request.

Amano disclose a substitute at least a part of the contents of the received service request with at least a part of the contents of the selected service request (paragraph 23, replacing the information based on what is recognized by the recognizer).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Regarding claim 10. Sugikawa et al. teach an information system comprising:
subscriber stations,

at least two service sources providing a respective service to subscriber stations of the system (column 11, lines 41-65, data processing sections, B, C, D, and E), and an access point providing said subscriber stations with access to services offered by said service sources (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device), said access point being arranged to analyze a service request received from a subscriber station in order to identify a predetermined keyword indicating the service source offering the requested service (column 11, lines 31-34, predetermined service data, i.e. interpret data as a keyword), and to forward said service request to the service source offering said service (column 11, lines 41-65, data processing sections, B, C, D, and E), said service sources being connected to the access point in order to receive a service request forwarded by said access point (column 6, lines 61-64, having access to the service request), and arranged to analyze a received service request in order to identify the requested service and to provide the subscriber station with the requested service, said system further comprising: a memory for storing only service requests which have led to successful identification of the requested service **and whose contents are correct (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services, the spec does not provide definition of the term correct, there examiner interprets since its in the memory that its correct).**

However, Sugikawa et al. does not teach an error correction device arranged to correct a received service request by utilizing the service requests stored in the memory, if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request, as no service source or no service can be identified, wherein said access point is arranged to process the corrected service request by carrying out said analyzing and forwarding to a service source, and said service sources are arranged to carry out said analyzing in order to identify the requested service and to provide the service to the subscriber station having transmitted the service request, when receiving such a corrected service request.

Amano disclose an error correction device arranged to correct a received service request by utilizing the service requests stored in the memory (paragraph 1—20, predetermine elements from application data that are recognized that they are incorrectly generated based on the stored application data), if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request, as no service source or no service can be identified (paragraph 83, if two values don't match, a check is perform and automatic correction is done, unless its disabled then its processed manually), wherein said access point is arranged to process the corrected service request by carrying out said analyzing and forwarding to a service source (paragraph 14, correcting errors that are recognized to be incorrect based on the predetermine input data), and said service sources are arranged to carry out said analyzing in order to identify the requested service (paragraph 14, correcting errors that are recognized to be incorrect based on the predetermine input data)and to provide the

service to the subscriber station having transmitted the service request, when receiving such a corrected service request (paragraph 65, transmitted the electronic data based on the service request).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Regarding claim 11, Sugikawa et al. further teach an information system according to claim 10, wherein said error correcting device is arranged to compare the contents of the received service request with the contents of the service requests stored in said memory (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services), to select the stored service request which, based on the comparison, is closest to the received service request (column 7, lines 40-46, selecting a communication device based on the request submitted), however, he does not teach to substitute at least a part of the contents of the received service request with at least a part of the contents of the selected service request.

Amano disclose a substitute at least a part of the contents of the received service request with at least a part of the contents of the selected service request (paragraph 23, replacing the information based on what is recognized by the recognizer).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et

al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Regarding claim 12, Sugikawa et al. further teach an information system according to claim 10, wherein said access point is connected to a mobile communication system (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device, i.e. examiner interprets communication device to be a mobile communication device), said subscriber stations are subscriber stations of the mobile communication system (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device), and the service requests are messages transmitted with said subscriber stations via the mobile communication system to the access point (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device).

Regarding claim 13, Sugikawa et al. further teach an information system according to claim 11, wherein said access point is connected to a mobile communication system (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device), said subscriber stations are subscriber stations of the mobile communication system (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any

communication device), and the service requests are messages transmitted with said subscriber stations via the mobile communication system to the access point (column 6, lines 61-64, interpretation of access point will be the point at which the service is requested, i.e. the service request is transmitted from any communication device).

Regarding claim 14, Sugikawa further teach an information system according to claim 10, wherein at least one of said service sources provides a service involving transmission of data to a subscriber station which has transmitted a service request (column 7, lines 16-33, communication device that transmit service request), said service source comprising a database containing data (column 9, lines 20-23, memory that stores documentary and diagrammatic output data), and that said service source is arranged to analyze a received service request in order to identify the requested service, to retrieve, from said database (column 12, lines 8-23, the control unit analyzes the destination device identification data of the received data), data associated with the identified service request, and to transmit said retrieved data via said information system to said subscriber station request (column 7, lines 16-33, communication device that transmit service request).

Regarding claim 15, Sugikawa et al. teach error correction device arranged to correct a received service request by utilizing information stored in a memory, **containing only service requests whose contents are correct the spec does not provide definition of the term correct, there examiner interprets since its in the memory that its correct**, said error correction device is arranged to

receive and store, in said memory, service requests which have led to successful identification of the requested service (column 11, lines 25-37, storing records data about service request programs and services), however, he does not teach correct the contents of a received service request by utilizing the service requests stored in the memory, and transmit said corrected service request for further processing.

Amano disclose correcting the contents of a received service request by utilizing the service requests stored in the memory (paragraph 1- 20, predetermine elements from application data that are recognized that they are incorrectly generated based on the stored application data and (paragraph 14, correction is made based on the application data written in a markup description language), and transmit said corrected service request for further processing (paragraph 108, transmit to another user via multiple intermediates (systems and persons).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Regarding claim 16. Sugikawa et al. the method according to claim 8, wherein the keyword is a user entered search term (col. 36, lines 40-63, input data that is entered by a input means, i.e keyboard, mouse, pen or the like).

Regarding claim 17. Sugikawa et al. teach the method according to claim 8, however he does not teach wherein the requested service is human perceivable data.

Amano disclose wherein the requested service is human perceivable data (paragraph 108; transmit to another user via multiple intermediates (systems and persons)).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Amano's application data error correction support into Sugikawa et al. communication device because there is a need to prevent errors or incorrect conversions that tend to occur during the re-input of text employing a use for writing data or sentences or to detect and correct errors as taught by Amano (paragraph 12).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed September 23, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Applicant argues that the reference of record does not teach memory only contains service request whose contents are correct.

i. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's argument because this limitation has been added as an amendment. However; the specification provides no definition of the term "correct" so examiner interprets that since the information is in the memory , that it's correct. Rejection of record is maintained.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KELLYE BUCKINGHAM whose telephone number is 571-270-1756. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday, 7:30-5:00 EST alt Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

November 25, 2008

/KELLYE BUCKINGHAM/
Examiner, Art Unit 2165

/K. B. P./

/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165